arXiv:1303.0308v1 [math.OC] 1 Mar 2013

Switched linear differential systems and their stability

J.C. Mayo-Maldonado, P. Rapisarda and P. Rocha

***Abstract*—We develop a behavioral framework for switched linear differential systems (SLDSs). The definition of a SLDS is introduced, and several conditions for stability are derived using the notion of positive-realness.**

***Index Terms*—switched systems; behaviors; quadratic differential forms; positive-realness.**

I. INTRODUCTION

In the classical approach (see for example [3], [5]), switched systems consist of a bank of systems represented in state-space or descriptor form (see [18]), together with a supervisory system that produces a switching signal determining which of the systems in the bank is currently active. When switching occurs, the continuity of the state trajectories may or not be required; in the latter case, "reset maps" are specified in order to produce new initial conditions for the post-switching evolution.

In many physical situations, modeling switched systems by means of state representations sharing the same state space is justified from first principles: for example, when dealing with switched electrical circuits, it is usually necessary to consider the state of the overall circuit in order to model the transitions between the different dynamical regimes. However, there are other situations in which modeling a switched system using representations that share a common, global state space is not justified from physical considerations; for example, when considering a control system consisting of a plant and a bank of controllers which may have different orders. In this case the dynamical regimes of the controlled system may have different degrees of freedom; it may be possible to conceive a global state space common to the different dynamics, but there is no compelling reason to do so. A more fundamental issue with the classical approach is that modeling a physical system from first principles hardly ever results in a state-space description- this usually needs to be constructed from the set of higher-order differential equations describing the model.

In this paper we propose a novel notion of switched system based on a behavioral point of view. In our approach a switched system consists of a set of dynamical systems described by linear, constant-coefficient higher-order differential equations, together with some "gluing conditions" that relate the system variables and their derivatives immediately before and after switching. Thus, we do not assume that the different dynamics are represented in state form; moreover, the behaviors describing the different dynamical regimes are not even assumed to share the same state space; the minimal state space dimension for the systems may be different.

A critical issue in switched systems is their stability, since switching among stable systems may give rise to instability. So many diverse solutions to this problem in the classical framework have been proposed that it is impossible to acknowledge all contributions in this area; we refer instead to [6] for an exhaustive survey of the available results and for some novel ones. In this paper, we shall concentrate on the Lyapunov approach to stability: we show that the existence of a suitably defined higher-order Lyapunov function also ensures the stability of the switched behavioral system, and we study sufficient conditions for the existence of such Lyapunov function.

The paper is organized as follows. The employed notation and a summary of the relevant background notions is given in section II. In section III we introduce the definition of switched linear differential structure (SLDS), and we discuss the concept of gluing conditions. In section IV we present a sufficient condition of Lyapunov type, based on the concept of strict positive-realness, for the stability of a SLDS consisting of two subsystems. In section V we introduce the notion of positive-real completion, and state a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of a Lyapunov function for a SLDS with two subsystems. Some important remarks are provided

J.C. Mayo-Maldonado and P. Rapisarda are with the CSPC group, School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, Great Britain, e-mail: `jcmm1g11,pr3@ecs.soton.ac.uk`, Tel: +(44)2380593367, Fax: +(44)2380594498.

P. Rocha is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, University of Oporto, Portugal, e-mail: `mprocha@fe.up.pt`, Tel: +(351)225081844, Fax: +(351)225081443.

in section VI. The proofs of the most technical results are given in the Appendix.

II. BACKGROUND MATERIAL

A. Notation

The space of $\mathtt{n}$ dimensional real vectors is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{n}}$, and that of $\mathtt{m}\times\mathtt{n}$ real matrices by $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{m}\times\mathtt{n}}$. $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{m}\times\bullet}$ denotes the space of real matrices with $\mathtt{m}$ rows and an unspecified finite number of columns, and $\mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\bullet}$ the space of real matrices with a finite but unspecified number of rows and columns. $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{m}\times\infty}$ denotes the set of real matrices with $\mathtt{m}$ rows and an infinite number of columns. $0_{\mathtt{m}\times\mathtt{m}}$ denotes the zero $\mathtt{m}\times\mathtt{m}$ matrix, and $I_{\mathtt{m}}$ denotes the $\mathtt{m}\times\mathtt{m}$ identity matrix. Given matrices A and B with the same number of columns, $\text{col}(A,B)$ denotes the matrix obtained by stacking A over B.

The ring of polynomials with real coefficients in the indeterminate ξ is denoted by $\mathbb{R}[\xi]$; the ring of two-variable polynomials with real coefficients in the indeterminates ζ and η is denoted by $\mathbb{R}[\zeta,\eta]$. $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{r}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ denotes the set of all $\mathtt{r}\times\mathtt{w}$ matrices with entries in the ring $\mathbb{R}[\xi]$, and $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{n}\times\mathtt{m}}[\zeta,\eta]$ that of $\mathtt{n}\times\mathtt{m}$ polynomial matrices in ζ and η. The set of rational $\mathtt{m}\times\mathtt{n}$ matrices is denoted by $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{m}\times\mathtt{n}}(\xi)$.

The set of infinitely differentiable functions from $\mathbb{R}$ to $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}}$ is denoted by $\mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}})$. If $f:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}^\bullet$, we denote $f(t^-):=\lim_{\tau\nearrow t}f(t)$ and $f(t^+):=\lim_{\tau\searrow t}f(t)$ provided that these limits exist. The set of linear differential systems with $\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}}$-valued signals is denoted by $\mathfrak{L}^{\mathtt{w}}$.

B. Linear differential behaviors

A *linear differential behavior* is a linear subspace $\mathfrak{B}$ of $\mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}})$ consisting of all solutions w of a given system of linear constant-coefficient differential equations, represented by

$$R\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)w=0, \tag{1}$$

where $R\in\mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$. Equation (1) is called a *kernel representation* of the behavior $\mathfrak{B}:=\{w\in\mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R},\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}})\mid w$ satisfies (1)$\}$, and w is called the *external variable* of $\mathfrak{B}$. The class of all such behaviors is denoted by $\mathfrak{L}^{\mathtt{w}}$. Kernel representations are not unique: for example, if $U\in\mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\bullet}[\xi]$ is *unimodular* (see [4] for a definition) and $\mathfrak{B}=\ker\ R\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, then also $\mathfrak{B}=\ker\ (UR)\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$.

When $\mathfrak{B}$ is *controllable* (see Ch. 5 of [11]), it can be represented in *image form*

$$w=M\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)\ell\ , \tag{2}$$

where $M\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{l}}[\xi]$ and ℓ is an auxiliary variable called the *latent variable*; i.e., $\mathfrak{B}:=\{w\mid\exists\ \ell$ such that (2) holds$\}$.

Given $\mathfrak{B}\in\mathfrak{L}^{\mathtt{w}}$, it may be possible to choose some components of the external variable w freely (in the sense of Def. 3.3.1 of [11]); such free variables are then called *input variables*. It can be shown that the maximal number of input variables is an invariant, denoted by $\mathtt{m}(\mathfrak{B})$. Once $\mathtt{m}(\mathfrak{B})$ free variables have been chose, the remaining components of w are *output variables*; evidently, the number $\mathtt{p}(\mathfrak{B}):=\mathtt{w}-\mathtt{m}(\mathfrak{B})$ of output variables is also an invariant. If $\mathfrak{B}$ has no input variables it is called *autonomous*; in this case $\mathtt{m}(\mathfrak{B})=0$, or equivalently $\mathtt{p}(\mathfrak{B})=\mathtt{w}$, and it can be shown that $\mathfrak{B}$ admits a kernel representation with R square and nonsingular. If $\mathfrak{B}$ is controllable, by permuting the components of w an image representation (2) can be achieved with $M=\text{col}(U,Y)$ and $U\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{l}\times\mathtt{l}}[\xi]$ nonsingular; then $u=U\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)\ell$ is an input variable, and $y=\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)\ell$ is an output variable. Note that $\mathtt{m}(\mathfrak{B})=\mathtt{l}$, the dimension of ℓ. The *transfer function* from u to y is the matrix of rational functions YU^{-1}. It can be shown that an input-output partition $w=\text{col}(u,y)$ can be found so that YU^{-1} is proper.

C. State maps

A latent variable ℓ is a *state variable* for $\mathfrak{B}$ if and only if there exist $E,F\in\mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\bullet}$, $G\in\mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\mathtt{w}}$ such that $\mathfrak{B}=\left\{w\mid\exists\ \ell\text{ s.t. }E\frac{d\ell}{dt}+F\ell+Gw=0\right\}$, i.e. if $\mathfrak{B}$ has a representation of first order in ℓ and zeroth order in w. The minimal number of state variables necessary to represent $\mathfrak{B}$ in this way is an invariant called the *McMillan degree* of $\mathfrak{B}$, denoted by $\mathtt{n}(\mathfrak{B})$.

In [13] it has been shown that a state variable for $\mathfrak{B}$ can be computed as the image of a polynomial differential operator called a *state map*. We now review the construction of state maps for autonomous behaviors.

1) State maps for autonomous systems: In this case, a state map acts on the external variable w. Let $\mathfrak{B}$ represented as in (1) with $R\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ nonsingular, and consider the set defined by

$$\mathfrak{X}(R):=\left\{f\in\mathbb{R}^{1\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]\ \mid\ fR^{-1}\text{ is strictly proper}\right\}. \tag{3}$$

$\mathfrak{X}(R)$ is a finite-dimensional subspace of the vector space $\mathbb{R}^{1\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ over $\mathbb{R}$. To construct a state map $X\in\mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ for $\mathfrak{B}$, choose a set of generators $x_i\in\mathbb{R}^{1\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$, $i=1,\dots,N$ of $\mathfrak{X}(R)$, and define $X:=\text{col}(x_i)_{i=1,\dots,N}$; to obtain a *minimal* state map, choose $\{x_i\}_{i=1,\dots,N}$ so that they form a basis of $\mathfrak{X}(R)$.

It can be shown (see Cor. 6.7 of [13]) that the McMillan degree $\mathtt{n}(\mathfrak{B})$, i.e. the minimal dimension of a state variable for $\mathfrak{B}$, equals $\deg(\det(R))$. Note that if $X \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ is a state map for $\mathfrak{B} = \ker\ R\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, then for every $F \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi]$, also $X'(\xi) := X(\xi) + F(\xi)R(\xi)$ is a state map, since $X'\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)w = X\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)w$ for all $w \in \mathfrak{B}$.

Finally, given an autonomous behavior $\ker\ R\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ associated with R nonsingular, it can be shown that there exists a state map X and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet \times \bullet}$, $F \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet \times \mathtt{w}}$ such that $\xi X(\xi) = AX(\xi) + FR(\xi)$.

2) Functions of the state: Let $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{L}^{\mathtt{w}}$, and let $X \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ be a state map for $\mathfrak{B}$ acting on w. A polynomial differential operator $d\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ is a (linear) *function of the state* of $\mathfrak{B}$ if there exists a constant vector $f \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \mathtt{w}}$ such that $d\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)w = fX\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)w$.

3) R-canonical representatives: We recall the notion of R-canonical representative of a differential operator. Let $R \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ be nonsingular, and let $f \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi]$; f can be uniquely written as $fR^{-1} = s + n$, where $s \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \mathtt{w}}(\xi)$ is a vector of strictly proper rational functions, and $n \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi]$. We call $sR \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ the (uniquely defined) *canonical representative of f modulo R*, denoted $f \mod R$. Note that the polynomial differential operators $f\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ and $f'\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, with $f' = f \mod R$, are *equivalent along* $\ker\ R\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ in the sense that $f\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)w = f'\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)w$ for all $w \in \ker\ R\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$. The definition of R-canonical representative extends in a natural way to polynomial matrices.

D. Quadratic differential forms and dissipativity

The parametrization of quadratic functionals of the system variables and their derivatives using two-variable polynomial matrices has been studied in [20], to which we refer for a thorough exposition.

1) Quadratic differential forms: Let $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}[\zeta, \eta]$; then $\Phi(\zeta, \eta) = \sum_{h,k} \Phi_{h,k} \zeta^h \eta^k$, where $\Phi_{h,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}$ and the sum extends over a finite set of nonnegative indices. $\Phi(\zeta, \eta)$ induces the *quadratic differential form* (QDF) acting on $\mathfrak{C}^\infty$-trajectories defined by $Q_\Phi(w) := \sum_{h,k} (\frac{d^h w}{dt^h})^\top \Phi_{h,k} \frac{d^k w}{dt^k}$. Without loss of generality one can assume a QDF to be induced by a *symmetric* two-variable polynomial matrix $\Phi(\zeta, \eta)$, i.e. one such that $\Phi(\zeta, \eta) = \Phi(\eta, \zeta)^\top$; we denote the set of such matrices by $\mathbb{R}_s^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}[\zeta, \eta]$.

$\Phi(\zeta, \eta)$ can be identified with its *coefficient matrix* $\widetilde{\Phi} := \left[\Phi_{h,k}\right]_{h,k=0,\ldots,\infty}$, in the sense that

$$\Phi(\zeta, \eta) = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathtt{w}} & \zeta I_{\mathtt{w}} & \cdots \end{bmatrix} \widetilde{\Phi} \begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathtt{w}} \\ \eta I_{\mathtt{w}} \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} .$$

Although $\tilde{\Phi}$ is infinite, only a finite number of its entries are nonzero, since the highest power of ζ and η in $\Phi(\zeta, \eta)$ is finite. Note that $\Phi(\zeta, \eta)$ is symmetric if and only if $\tilde{\Phi}^\top = \tilde{\Phi}$. In that case, $\tilde{\Phi}$ can be factored as $\tilde{\Phi} := \tilde{M}^\top \Sigma_\Phi \tilde{M}$ with $\tilde{M}$ an infinite matrix with an infinite number of rows and all but a finite number of elements equal to zero, and Σ_Φ a signature matrix. The latter decomposition leads after premultiplication by $\begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathtt{w}} & \zeta I_{\mathtt{w}} & \cdots \end{bmatrix}$ and postmultiplication by col $\begin{bmatrix} I_{\mathtt{w}} & \eta I_{\mathtt{w}} & \cdots \end{bmatrix}$ to the factorization $\Phi(\zeta, \eta) = M(\zeta)^\top \Sigma_\Phi M(\eta)$ which, if we take $\tilde{M}$ surjective, is called a *canonical factorization* of $\Phi(\zeta, \eta)$.

Given Q_Ψ, its *derivative* is the QDF Q_Φ defined by $Q_\Phi(w) := \frac{d}{dt}(Q_\Psi(w))$ for all $w \in \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}})$; this holds if and only if $\Phi(\zeta, \eta) = (\zeta + \eta)\Psi(\zeta, \eta)$ (see [20], p. 1710).

A QDF Q_Φ is *nonnegative along* $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{L}^{\mathtt{w}}$, denoted by $Q_\Phi \overset{\mathfrak{B}}{\geq} 0$ if $Q_\Phi(w) \geq 0$ for all $w \in \mathfrak{B}$; and *positive along* $\mathfrak{B}$, denoted by $Q_\Phi \overset{\mathfrak{B}}{>} 0$, if $Q_\Phi \overset{\mathfrak{B}}{\geq} 0$ and $[Q_\Phi(w) = 0; w \in \mathfrak{B}] \implies [w = 0]$. If $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}})$, then we call Q_Φ simply *nonnegative*, respectively *positive*. Characterizations of nonnegativity and positivity in terms of algebraic properties of the matrix $\Phi(\zeta, \eta)$ are given in [20], pp. 1712-1713.

An analogous concept of R-canonical representative is introduced for two-variable polynomial matrices; two QDFs Q_{Φ_1}, Q_{Φ_2} are *equivalent along* $\ker\ R\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ if $Q_{\Phi_1}(w) = Q_{\Phi_2}(w)$ for all $w \in \ker\ R\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$. Among all QDFs that are equivalent to a given Q_Φ, there is exactly one which is R-canonical. This canonical representative can be computed as follows. Write $\Phi(\zeta, \eta) = M(\zeta)^\top N(\eta)$ (such a polynomial factorization can be computed factorizing the coefficient matrix of $\Phi(\zeta, \eta)$ as $\widetilde{\Phi} = \widetilde{M}^\top \widetilde{N}$). Now compute the R-canonical representatives M' of M and N' of N. Then the R-canonical representative of $\Phi(\zeta, \eta)$ is $M'(\zeta)^\top N'(\eta)$.

2) Dissipativity and Positive Realness: A controllable behavior $\mathfrak{B} \in \mathfrak{L}^{\mathtt{w}}$ is *dissipative* with respect to the *supply rate* Q_Φ if there exists a QDF Q_Ψ, called a *storage function*, such that $Q_\Phi(w) - \frac{d}{dt}Q_\Psi(w) \geq 0$ for all $w \in \mathfrak{B}$. This inequality holds if and only if there exists a *dissipation function*, i.e. a QDF $Q_\Delta \overset{\mathfrak{B}}{\geq} 0$ such that for all $w \in \mathfrak{B}$ of compact support it holds that $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Q_\Phi(w)(t)dt = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} Q_\Delta(w)(t)dt$ (see Prop. 5.4 of [20]). Moreover, there is a one-one correspondence between storage- and dissipation functions, defined by $\frac{d}{dt}Q_\Psi(w) + Q_\Delta(w) = Q_\Phi(w)$ for all $w \in \mathfrak{B}$. If $\mathfrak{B} = \mathfrak{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}})$, this equality holds if and only if $(\zeta + \eta)\Psi(\zeta, \eta) + \Delta(\zeta, \eta) = \Phi(\zeta, \eta)$.

Recall the notion of strict positive-real rational function (see [9]): a strictly proper rational matrix $G := R_2 R_1^{-1}$, with $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times \mathtt{w}}[\xi]$, is *strictly positive real* if $G(\xi)$ is real when ξ is real, G is analytic in the righthalf plane, and $G(-j\omega)^\top + G(j\omega) > 0 \ \forall\ \omega \in \mathbb{R}$.

III. SWITCHED LINEAR DIFFERENTIAL SYSTEMS

A *switching linear differential structure* is a finite family of linear differential systems, together with a set of switching signals that specify which system is active at each time instant, and a set of "gluing conditions" regulating the concatenation of the trajectories at the switching instants.

Definition 1. *A* switching linear differential structure (SLDS) Σ *is a quadruple* $\Sigma = \{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{G}\}$ *where* $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \dots, N\} \subset \mathbb{N}$, *is the set of* indices*;* $\mathcal{F} = (\mathfrak{B}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{B}_N)$, *with* $\mathfrak{B}_j \in \mathfrak{L}^{\mathtt{w}}$ *for* $j \in \mathcal{P}$, *is the* bank of behaviors*;* $\mathcal{S} = \{s : \mathbb{R} \to \mathcal{P} \mid s \text{ is piecewise constant and right-continuous}\}$, *is the set of admissible* switching signals*; and*

$$\mathcal{G} = \{\left((k,\ell), G^-_{k\to\ell}(\xi), G^+_{k\to\ell}(\xi)\right) \mid \left(G^-_{k\to\ell}(\xi), G^+_{k\to\ell}(\xi)\right) \in (\mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi])^2\} ,$$

with $(k,\ell) \in \mathcal{P}\times\mathcal{P}$, $k \neq \ell$ *is the set of* gluing conditions. *The set of* switching instants *associated with* $s \in \mathcal{S}$ *is defined by* $\mathbb{T}_s := \{t \in \mathbb{R} \mid \lim_{\tau \nearrow t} s(\tau) \neq s(t)\} = \{t_1, t_2, \dots\}$, *where* $t_i < t_{i+1}$.

A SLDS induces a switched behavior, defined as follows.

Definition 2. *Let* $\Sigma = \{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{G}\}$ *be a SLDS, and let* $s \in \mathcal{S}$. *The* s-switched linear differential behavior $\mathfrak{B}^s$ *is the set of trajectories* $w : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}}$ *that satisfy the following two conditions:*

1) *for all* $t_i, t_{i+1} \in \mathbb{T}_s$, *there exists* $\mathfrak{B}_k \in \mathcal{F}$, $k \in \mathcal{P}$ *such that* $w|_{[t_i,t_{i+1})} \in \mathfrak{B}_k|_{[t_i,t_{i+1})}$*;*
2) w *satisfies the gluing conditions* $\mathcal{G}$ *at the switching instants for each* $t_i \in \mathbb{T}_s$, *i.e.*

$$(G^+_{s(t_{i-1})\to s(t_i)}(\frac{d}{dt}))w(t_i^+) = (G^-_{s(t_{i-1})\to s(t_i)}(\frac{d}{dt}))w(t_i^-) \ .$$

The switched linear differential behavior (SLDB) $\mathfrak{B}^\Sigma$ *of* Σ *is defined by* $\mathfrak{B}^\Sigma := \bigcup_{s\in\mathcal{S}} \mathfrak{B}^s$.

In the rest of this paper we make the standard assumption (see e.g. sect. 1.3.3 of [17]) that the number of switching instants in a given finite interval of $\mathbb{R}$ is finite.

The polynomial matrices $G^+_{k\to\ell}(\xi)$, $G^-_{k\to\ell}(\xi)$ in Def.s 1 and 2 specify concatenation conditions on w at the switching instants. These conditions are an essential component of the dynamical laws of a switched linear system to be analyzed and are defined according to the particular nature of the switched system under study.

Example 1. Assume that depending on the value of the switching signal, a plant Σ_P with two external variables, described by the differential equation $\frac{d}{dt}w_1 - w_1 - w_2 = 0$, is connected with one of two possible controllers Σ_{C_1} and Σ_{C_2}, described respectively by $-3\frac{d}{dt}w_1 - w_1 - \frac{d}{dt}w_2 = 0$ and $-2w_1 - w_2 = 0$. Depending on which controller is active, the resulting closed-loop behaviors are $\mathfrak{B}_1 := \ker \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt}-1 & -1 \\ -3\frac{d}{dt}-1 & -\frac{d}{dt}\end{bmatrix}$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2 := \ker \begin{bmatrix} \frac{d}{dt}-1 & -1 \\ -2 & -1\end{bmatrix}$. Note that $\mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2$ have different McMillan degree (2 and 1, respectively). We define the gluing conditions for the SLDS associated with $\mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2$ by $G^-_{2\to1}(\xi) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & -2\end{bmatrix}$, $G^+_{2\to1}(\xi) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0\end{bmatrix}$ and by $G^-_{1\to2}(\xi) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}$, $G^+_{1\to2}(\xi) := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}$. The rationale underlying our choice of gluing conditions is that any trajectory of $\mathfrak{B}_1$ is uniquely specified by the instantaneous values of $\mathrm{col}(w_1, w_2)$, while a trajectory of $\mathfrak{B}_2$ is uniquely specified by the instantaneous value of w_2. Thus, when switching from the dynamics of $\mathfrak{B}_1$ to those of $\mathfrak{B}_2$, we require that the values of w_2 before and after the switching instant coincide. In a switch from $\mathfrak{B}_2$ to $\mathfrak{B}_1$, since the second differential equation describing $\mathfrak{B}_2$ yields $w_2 = -2w_1$ before the switch, we impose that $w_2(t_k^+) = w_2(t_k^-) = -2w_1(t_k^-)$. Note that this makes the switched trajectory as smooth as possible, taking into account the restrictions imposed by each individual behavior $\mathfrak{B}_1$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2$. $\square$

While in principle Def. 1 does not restrict the choice of gluing conditions, in practice they should be *well-posed*, according to the following definition.

Definition 3. *Let* Σ *be a SLDS as in Def. 1. Let* $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ *be a minimal state map for* $\mathfrak{B}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. *The gluing conditions* $\mathcal{G}$ *are* well-posed *if for all* $k, \ell = 1, \dots, N$ *with* $k \neq \ell$ *there exists a map* $L_{k\to\ell} : \mathbb{R}^\bullet \to \mathbb{R}^\bullet$ *such that for all* $t_i \in \mathbb{T}_s$

$$\begin{aligned} &[s(t_{i-1}) = k, s(t_i) = \ell] \\ &\text{and } \left[G^+_{k\to\ell}\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) w(t_i^+) = G^-_{k\to\ell}\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) w(t_i^-)\right] \\ &\Longrightarrow \left[X_\ell\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) w(t_i^+) = L_{k\to\ell}\left(X_k\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) w(t_i^-)\right)\right] \ . \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $\mathcal{G}$ is well-posed then after each switching instant the state of the active behavior is specified as a function of the state before the switch. This property expresses the reasonable requirements that after the switch: a) it should be possible to uniquely define (together with the free components of w) the future evolution of a past trajectory; and b) that there be a causal link between the future and the past evolution.

Example 2. The gluing conditions of Example 1 are well-posed. A minimal state map for $\mathfrak{B}_1$ is $X_1(\xi) := I_2$, and a minimal state map for $\mathfrak{B}_2$ is $X_2(\xi) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Def. 3 is satisfied with $L_{1\to 2} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $L_{2\to 1} := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}^\top$. □

In the rest of this paper we focus on the stability problem for SLDS, and we consider SLDS consisting of two autonomous behaviors: thus in the following $\mathcal{F} = (\mathfrak{B}_1, \mathfrak{B}_2)$, with $\mathfrak{B}_j = \ker\ R_j\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, where $R_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$, $j = 1, 2$, are nonsingular polynomial matrices. Moreover, *we assume that R_1 is column reduced* (see [4]), and that $R_2 R_1^{-1}$ *is strictly proper*. The first assumption is not restrictive, since a column-reduced kernel representation of $\mathfrak{B}_1$ (for example, the row-Hermite form described in [4]) can be obtained by premultiplication of an arbitrary kernel representation by a suitable unimodular matrix. The second assumption has important consequences; to state them we need first to introduce the notion of *standard state map*. Let $\mathfrak{B} = \ker\ R\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ with $R \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ nonsingular, and assume that R is column-reduced. Denote the column degrees of R by δ_j, $j = 1, \ldots, \mathtt{w}$, and consider the polynomial vectors

$$e_j \xi^k\ ,\ j = 1, \ldots, \mathtt{w}\ ,\ \ k = 0, \ldots, \delta_j - 1\ , \tag{4}$$

where e_j is the j-th vector of the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^{1\times\mathtt{w}}$. It follows from the material in section II-C1 that the vectors (4) form a basis for the state space of $\mathfrak{B}$. Any matrix whose rows are the vectors (4) (or any permutation thereof) is called a *standard state map* for $\mathfrak{B}$. The following is a crucial result used repeatedly in the rest of the paper.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathfrak{B}_i = \ker\ R_i\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, $i = 1, 2$. Assume that $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ are nonsingular, that R_1 is column reduced, and that $R_2 R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper. Denote $n_i := \deg(\det(R_i))$; then $n_2 < n_1$, and there exist $X_1' \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$, $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ such that $X_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ is a standard state map for $\mathfrak{B}_2$, and the polynomial matrix $X_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ defined by*

$$X_1(\xi) := \begin{bmatrix} X_2(\xi) \\ X_1'(\xi) \end{bmatrix}\ , \tag{5}$$

is a standard state map for $\mathfrak{B}_1$. Moreover, there exists $\Pi \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times n_2}$ such that $X_1'(\xi) \mod R_2 = \Pi X_2(\xi)$.

Proof: The inequality $n_2 < n_1$ follows straightforwardly from the following result and the material in section II-C1.

Lemma 2. *Let $R_1, R_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$, be such that $R_2 R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper, and define $\mathfrak{X}_i := \{f \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi] \mid f R_i^{-1}$ is strictly proper$\}$, $i = 1, 2$. Then $\mathfrak{X}_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{X}_1$.*

Proof: See the Appendix. ■

To prove the claim on X_1 defined by (5), bring R_2 via left unimodular multiplication to a column reduced form R_2' (for instance, into row-Hermite form). Construct a standard basis for the space $\left\{f \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi] \mid f {R_2'}^{-1} \text{ is strictly proper}\right\}$, and arrange the vectors of this basis in a matrix $X_2(\xi)$; then $X_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ is a standard state map for $\mathfrak{B}_2 = \ker\ R_2'\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) = \ker\ R_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$. Since R_1 is column reduced and $R_2 R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper, applying Lemma 2 again we conclude that the rows of $X_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ are a subset of the rows of any standard state map $X_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ for $\mathfrak{B}_1$. Now rearrange the rows of $X_1(\xi)$.

To prove the existence of Π, observe that each row of $X_1' \mod R_2$ belongs to the state space $\mathfrak{X}_2$ of $\mathfrak{B}_2 = \ker\ R_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, and consequently can be written as a linear combination of the rows of X_2. This concludes the proof. ■

Example 3. When $\mathtt{w} = 1$, R_1 is trivially column-reduced, and $R_2 R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper if and only if $n_1 = \deg(R_1) > \deg(R_2) = n_2$. A standard state map for $\mathfrak{B}_1 = \ker\ R_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ consists of ξ^k, $k = 0, \ldots, n_1 - 1$, whose first n_2 elements form a standard basis for the state space of $\mathfrak{B}_2 = \ker\ R_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$. The rows of the matrix Π defined in Lemma 1 consist of the coefficients of the polynomials $\xi^k \mod R_2(\xi)$, $k = n_2, \ldots, n_1 - 1$. □

In the rest of this paper we consider *standard SLDS*, defined as follows.

Definition 4. *Let $\Sigma = \{\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{G}\}$ be a SLDS with $\mathcal{F} = (\mathfrak{B}_1, \mathfrak{B}_2)$, where $\mathfrak{B}_j = \ker\ R_j\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, $j = 1, 2$, with $R_j \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ nonsingular polynomial matrices, R_1 column reduced, and $R_2 R_1^{-1}$ strictly proper. Denote $n_j := \deg(\det(R_j))$, $j = 1, 2$, and let $X_1' \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$, $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ and $\Pi \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times n_2}$ be defined as in Lemma 1. Σ is a* standard SLDS *if the gluing conditions are $\left(G^-_{2\to 1}(\xi), G^+_{2\to 1}(\xi)\right) := \left(\begin{bmatrix} X_2(\xi) \\ \Pi X_2(\xi) \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} X_2(\xi) \\ X_1'(\xi) \end{bmatrix}\right)$ and $\left(G^-_{1\to 2}(\xi), G^+_{1\to 2}(\xi)\right) := (X_2(\xi), X_2(\xi))$.*

It is a matter of straightforward verification to check that the gluing conditions of a standard SLDS are well-posed.

Example 4. Consider the case of Example 3, and assume that R_1 and R_2 are monic, and that $n_1 = n_2 + 1$. Denote $R_2(\xi) =: \sum_{j=0}^{n_1-1} R_{2,j}\xi^j$. The gluing conditions of the corresponding SLDS are $\left(G^-_{2\to 1}(\xi), G^+_{2\to 1}(\xi)\right) =$

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi^{n_1-2} \\ -R_{2,0} - \ldots - R_{2,n_1-2}\xi^{n_1-2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi^{n_1-2} \\ \xi^{n_1-1} \end{bmatrix}\right) \quad \text{and}$$

$$\left(G^-_{1\to 2}(\xi), G^+_{1\to 2}(\xi)\right) \quad = \quad \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi^{n_1-2} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ \xi^{n_1-2} \end{bmatrix}\right).$$

When switching from $\mathfrak{B}_2$ to $\mathfrak{B}_1$, to obtain “initial conditions” uniquely specifying $w \in \mathfrak{B}_1$, we need to define the $(n_1 - 1)$-th derivative of w after the switching instant. The gluing conditions impose that this coincides with the value of the $(n_1 - 1)$-th derivative of w before the switching, given by the equality $\frac{d^{n_1-1}}{dt^{n_1-1}}w = -R_{2,0}w - \ldots - R_{2,n-2}\frac{d^{n_1-2}}{dt^{n_1-2}}w$ arising from the fact that $w \in \mathfrak{B}_2$ before the switch. When switching from $\mathfrak{B}_1$ to $\mathfrak{B}_2$, we project the vector of derivatives characteristic of a trajectory $w \in \mathfrak{B}_1$ down onto the shorter vector of derivatives characteristic of a trajectory $w \in \mathfrak{B}_2$. Note that our choice of gluing conditions guarantees that the corresponding trajectory is as smooth as possible. $\square$

IV. POSITIVE-REALNESS AND LYAPUNOV STABILITY OF SLDS

We call a SLDB $\mathfrak{B}^\Sigma$ (and by extension, the SLDS Σ) *asymptotically stable* if $\lim_{t\to\infty} w(t) = 0$ for all $w \in \mathfrak{B}^\Sigma$; note that if $\mathfrak{B}^\Sigma$ is stable, all the $\mathfrak{B}_i$ in $\mathcal{F}$ are autonomous, since they cannot have free variables. Our notion of stability, under arbitrary switching signals, is analogous to the notion of *uniform stability* of the classical switching systems literature, see section 2.1.1 of [5].

When dealing with linear differential behaviors, asymptotic stability can be proved by producing a *higher-order Lyapunov function* (see [10], [20]), i.e. a quadratic differential form Q_Φ such that $Q_\Phi \overset{\mathfrak{B}}{\geq} 0$ and $\frac{d}{dt}Q_\Phi \overset{\mathfrak{B}}{<} 0$, see Th. 4.3 of [20]. In the classical framework for switched systems it is often difficult to find a *common* Lyapunov function, and *multiple* Lyapunov functions are used instead (see section III.B of [6]). This situation arises naturally in our framework, where the McMillan degrees of the behaviors of the SLDS are in general not equal; hence the following definition.

Definition 5. *Let Σ be a SLDS as in Def. 1. A QDF Q_Ψ is a* Lyapunov function *for Σ if Q_{Ψ_i} is a Lyapunov function for $\mathfrak{B}_i = \ker\ R_i\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, where $\Psi_i(\zeta,\eta) = \Psi(\zeta,\eta) \mod R_i$, $i = 1,\ldots,N$; and moreover, for every $w \in \mathfrak{B}^\Sigma$ and every switching instant t_k it holds that $Q_{\Psi_{s(t_{k-1})}}(w)(t_k^-) \geq Q_{\Psi_{s(t_k)}}(w)(t_k^+)$.*

The crucial requirement in Def. 5 is that at each switching instant the value of Q_Ψ does not increase; it follows from standard arguments (see Th. 4.1 of [21]) that if a SLDS Σ has a Lyapunov function, then Σ is asymptotically stable.

This section is devoted to the proof of a sufficient condition for the existence of a Lyapunov function for a standard SLDS. In the following result, we associate to the matrices R_1, R_2 in Def. 4 the transfer function $R_2R_1^{-1}$ of the system described in image form by $\mathrm{col}(R_1, R_2)$. The next result states that if $R_2R_1^{-1}$ is strictly positive-real, then there exists a storage function Q_Ψ, induced by a *symmetric two-variable polynomial matrix* $\Psi \in \mathbb{R}_s^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\zeta,\eta]$, associated to $R_2R_1^{-1}$ that is a Lyapunov function for the SLDS.

Theorem 1. *Let Σ be a standard SLDS with $\mathcal{F} = \left\{\mathfrak{B}_1 = \ker\ R_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right), \mathfrak{B}_2 = \ker\ R_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)\right\}$. Define*

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(\zeta,\eta) :&= \begin{bmatrix} R_1(\zeta)^\top & R_2(\zeta)^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0_{\mathtt{w}} & I_{\mathtt{w}} \\ I_{\mathtt{w}} & 0_{\mathtt{w}} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} R_1(\eta) \\ R_2(\eta) \end{bmatrix} \\ &= R_1(\zeta)^\top R_2(\eta) + R_2(\zeta)^\top R_1(\eta)\ .\end{aligned}$$

Assume $R_2R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper and strictly positive-real. There exists $A \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ nonsingular such that $\det(A)$ is an anti-Hurwitz polynomial, and AR_1^{-1} is strictly proper. Moreover,

$$\Psi(\zeta,\eta) := \frac{\Phi(\zeta,\eta) - A(\zeta)^\top A(\eta)}{\zeta+\eta} \in \mathbb{R}_s^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\zeta,\eta]\ , \qquad (6)$$

induces a Lyapunov function Q_Ψ for Σ.

Proof: $R_2R_1^{-1}$ being strictly positive real implies that $\Phi(-j\omega, j\omega) > 0$ for all $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. By standard results on polynomial spectral factorization (see [2]), we conclude that there exists $A \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ such that $\det(A)$ is anti-Hurwitz and $\Phi(\xi,-\xi) - A(-\xi)^\top A(\xi) = 0$. This implies that $\Phi(\zeta,\eta) - A(\zeta)^\top A(\eta)$ is divisible by $(\zeta+\eta)$ and therefore there exists $\Psi(\zeta,\eta)$ as in (6). We prove that Q_Ψ is a Lyapunov function for Σ by showing that it satisfies the conditions

C1. $Q_\Psi \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1}{\geq} 0$ and $\frac{d}{dt}Q_\Psi \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1}{<} 0$;

C2. $Q_\Psi \overset{\mathfrak{B}_2}{\geq} 0$ and $\frac{d}{dt}Q_\Psi \overset{\mathfrak{B}_2}{<} 0$;

C3. Q_Ψ does not increase at switching instants.

To prove **C1**, first use the fact that strict positive-realness implies that the largest storage function (corresponding to the anti-Hurwitz factorization of $\Phi(-\xi,\xi)$, see Th. 5.7 of [20]) is nonnegative definite, i.e. $Q_\Psi \geq 0$ (see [20], Theorem 6.4); this implies *a fortiori* that $Q_\Psi \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1}{\geq} 0$. To prove the second claim of **C1**, note that from (6) it follows that $\frac{d}{dt}Q_\Psi \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1}{=} -A\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)^\top A\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$. This functional is strictly negative along $\mathfrak{B}_1$, since A is anti-Hurwitz and R_1 is Hurwitz.

To prove that condition **C2** is satisfied, we first compute the canonical representative of $\Psi(\zeta,\eta)$ modulo R_2, $\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) := \Psi(\zeta,\eta) \bmod R_2$. Since $Q_\Psi \overset{\mathfrak{B}_2}{=} Q_{\Psi'}$ and $Q_\Psi \geq 0$, it follows that $Q_{\Psi'} \overset{\mathfrak{B}_2}{\geq} 0$. To prove the second part of **C2**, observe that the canonical representative of the derivative of $Q_{\Psi'}$ is induced by $(\zeta+\eta)\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) := (\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta,\eta) \bmod R_2 = -A'(\zeta)^\top A'(\eta)$, where A' is the canonical representative of A modulo R_2. Consequently, to prove that $\frac{d}{dt}Q_{\Psi'} \overset{\mathfrak{B}_2}{<} 0$ it suffices to show that $\text{col}(A'(\lambda), R_2(\lambda))$ is full column rank for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, which guarantees that $\frac{d}{dt}\left(Q_{\Psi'}(w)\right)$ is non zero for the trajectories of $\mathfrak{B}_2$. Assume by contradiction that there exists $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\text{col}(A'(\lambda^*), R_2(\lambda^*))$ is not full column rank. Then $R_2(\lambda^*)$ is not full rank and, since R_2 is Hurwitz, we conclude that $\lambda^* \in \mathbb{C}^-$. Also $A'(\lambda^*)$ is not full rank, and since $A(\xi) = A'(\xi) + P(\xi)R_2(\xi)$ for some $P \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$, this implies that $A(\lambda^*)$ is not full rank. Since $\det(A)$ is anti-Hurwitz, this yields a contradiction. Condition **C2** is satisfied.

We now prove that condition **C3** is satisfied; the following fundamental fact will be instrumental to this purpose, and will be repeatedly used in this paper.

Lemma 3. *Let $N, D \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ with D nonsingular. Let ND^{-1} be the transfer function of the system described in image form by $\text{col}(D,N)$. Assume that ND^{-1} is strictly proper and strictly positive real. Define the supply rate $\Phi(\zeta,\eta) := D(\zeta)^\top N(\eta) + N(\zeta)^\top D(\eta)$. Let $\Delta(\zeta,\eta)$ be a corresponding dissipation function, and write $\Delta(\zeta,\eta) = Q(\zeta)^\top Q(\eta)$, for some $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$. Then QD^{-1} is strictly proper. Moreover, let Q_Ψ be a storage function, and let $\Psi(\zeta,\eta) = M(\zeta)^\top \Sigma_\Psi M(\eta)$ be a canonical factorization of $\Psi(\zeta,\eta)$, for some $M \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ and some signature matrix Σ_Ψ. Then MD^{-1} is strictly proper.*

Proof: See the Appendix. ■

It follows from the material gathered in sections II-C1 and II-C2 and from Lemma 3 that having chosen a standard state map for $\mathfrak{B}_1$ according to Lemma 1, we can write $\Psi(\zeta,\eta) = X_1(\zeta)^\top \widetilde{\Psi} X_1(\eta)$ for some $\widetilde{\Psi} = \widetilde{\Psi}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1\times n_1}$. Finally, since AR_1^{-1} is strictly proper, there exists $\tilde{\Delta} = \tilde{\Delta}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1\times n_1}$ such that $\Delta(\zeta,\eta) = A(\zeta)^\top A(\eta) = X_1(\zeta)^\top \tilde{\Delta} X_1(\eta)$.

To prove that **C3** is satisfied first consider the case of a switch from $\mathfrak{B}_1$ to $\mathfrak{B}_2$ at t_k. Taking the standard gluing conditions into account, we want to prove that

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_2(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \\ X_1'(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \end{bmatrix}^\top \widetilde{\Psi} \begin{bmatrix} X_2(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \\ X_1'(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} X_2(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^+) \\ \Pi X_2(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^+) \end{bmatrix}^\top \widetilde{\Psi} \begin{bmatrix} X_2(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^+) \\ \Pi X_2(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^+) \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \; .$$

This inequality can be rewritten as

$$\begin{bmatrix} X_2(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \\ X_1'(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \end{bmatrix}^\top \left(\widetilde{\Psi} - \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_2} & \Pi^\top \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \widetilde{\Psi} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_2} & 0 \\ \Pi & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} X_2(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \\ X_1'(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \; . \tag{7}$$

Since $X_1(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) = \begin{bmatrix} X_2(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \\ X_1'(\frac{d}{dt})w(t_k^-) \end{bmatrix}$ is arbitrary in $\mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ due to the minimality of $X_1(\xi)$, inequality (7) is equivalent with $\widetilde{\Psi} - \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_2} & \Pi^\top \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \widetilde{\Psi} \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_2} & 0 \\ \Pi & 0 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0$. Now partition $\widetilde{\Psi} =: \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{11} & \Psi_{12} \\ \Psi_{12}^\top & \Psi_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, with $\Psi_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2\times n_2}$, $\Psi_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2\times(n_1-n_2)}$ and $\Psi_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times(n_1-n_2)}$. After standard linear algebra manipulations, we obtain that (7) is equivalent with

$$\begin{bmatrix} -(\Psi_{12} + \Pi^\top\Psi_{22})\Psi_{22}^{-1}(\Psi_{12}^\top + \Psi_{22}\Pi) & 0 \\ 0 & \Psi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \; .$$

A standard linear algebra argument shows that the inequality holds if and only if $\Psi_{12}^\top + \Psi_{22}\Pi = 0$. In order to prove that this is the case, consider first the following lemma.

Lemma 4. *Define $k := \lim_{\xi\to\infty} \xi X_1'(\xi) R_1(\xi)^{-1}$; then $k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times\mathtt{w}}$. Moreover, $R_2(\xi) = k^\top\left(\Psi_{12}^\top X_2(\xi) + \Psi_{22}X_1'(\xi)\right)$.*

Proof: See the Appendix. ■

It follows from Lemma 4 and the last statement of Lemma 1 that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= R_2(\xi) \bmod R_2 \\ &= k^\top\left(\Psi_{12}^\top X_2(\xi) + \Psi_{22}X_1'(\xi)\right) \bmod R_2 \\ &= k^\top\left(\Psi_{12}^\top + \Psi_{22}\Pi\right) X_2(\xi) \; . \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Now recall that the rows of $X_2(\xi)$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{R}$, since they are part of a minimal state map. Consequently (8) implies $k^\top(\Psi_{12}^\top + \Psi_{22}\Pi) = 0$. We now show that $k^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times(n_1-n_2)}$ is square and nonsingular; this will lead to the desired equality $\Psi_{12}^\top + \Psi_{22}\Pi = 0$.

Lemma 5. *Define k as in Lemma 4. Then $n_1 - n_2 = \mathtt{w}$, and k is nonsingular.*

Proof: See the Appendix. ■

From Lemma 5 we conclude that the inequality (7) is always satisfied, and consequently Q_Ψ does not increase when switching from $\mathfrak{B}_1$ to $\mathfrak{B}_2$.

To conclude the proof of the Theorem we need to show that the value of Q_Ψ does not increase when we switch from $\mathfrak{B}_2$ to $\mathfrak{B}_1$. It is a matter of straightforward verification that for this type of switch, the standard gluing conditions imply that the value of $Q_\Psi(w)$ before and after the switch is the same. The claim of the Theorem is proved. ■

Remark 1. QDFs act on $\mathfrak{C}^\infty$-functions, while the trajectories of a SLDS are in general non-differentiable; however, this mismatch in the degree of differentiability is relevant neither to Th. 1 nor to the other results presented in this paper, since we only use the calculus of two-variable polynomial matrices associated with QDFs as an *algebraic* tool. For example, in the proof of Th. 1 when considering the value of the functional Q_Ψ before and after a switch, only the properties of its coefficient matrix are being used. □

Remark 2. Theorem 1 reduces the problem of finding a Lyapunov function for a standard SLDS to performing a polynomial spectral factorization, for which standard procedures can be used, and computing $\Psi(\zeta,\eta)$ from formula (6). □

Remark 3. In the scalar case ($\mathtt{w}=1$) the proof of Th. 1 simplifies considerably; from standard results in the theory of scalar rational positive-real functions it follows that the difference in the (McMillan) degrees of R_1 and R_2 is one, and several of the intermediate steps necessary in the proof of the multivariable case are trivial. See [12] for details. □

Remark 4. Theorem 1 holds true also if the assumption on the strict properness $R_2R_1^{-1}$ is relaxed to $R_2R_1^{-1}$ being *bi-proper*, i.e. proper and with a proper inverse. It follows from the material in section II-C1 that in this case the state space of $\ker\ R_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ and that of $\ker\ R_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ are the same. Choose the gluing conditions to be $\left(\mathcal{G}^-_{1\to2}(\xi),\mathcal{G}^+_{1\to2}(\xi)\right) := (X(\xi),X(\xi))$, $\left(\mathcal{G}^-_{2\to1}(\xi),\mathcal{G}^+_{2\to1}(\xi)\right) := (X(\xi),X(\xi))$. It is a matter of straightforward verification to check that the largest storage function for $R_2R_1^{-1}$ yields the desired Lyapunov function. For the scalar case ($\mathtt{w}=1$), this result has been proved in [14]. □

Remark 5. In the state-space framework for switched systems it is well-known that if the open-loop transfer function of a system is positive-real, then all closed-loop systems obtained from it by state feedback share a quadratic common Lyapunov function (see section 2.3.2 of [5] and [15], [16]). Th. 1 offers a new perspective on the relation between positive-realness and stability of switched systems: in our framework, the different dynamical regimes do not arise from closing the loop around some fixed plant, and positive-realness arises from the interplay of the dynamics of the different systems. □

Remark 6. Positive realness is only a sufficient condition for the stability of switched differential systems, and not surprisingly it is not necessary. Define $R_1(\xi) := \begin{bmatrix}\xi+1 & 0\\ 2 & \xi+2\end{bmatrix}$, $R_2(\xi) := \begin{bmatrix}\xi+3 & 0\\ -5 & \xi+\frac{1}{2}\end{bmatrix}$. It is readily verified that $V(w_1,w_2) := \begin{bmatrix}w_1 & w_2\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}9 & 4\\ 4 & 2\end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix}w_1\\ w_2\end{bmatrix}$ is a common Lyapunov function (in the classical sense) for $\ker\ R_i\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, $i=1,2$; however, $R_2R_1^{-1}$ is not positive real. □

V. Positive Real Completions

Given a standard SLDS, the strict positive-realness assumption on $R_2R_1^{-1}$ is in general not satisfied. The idea we pursue in this section is to "complete" R_2 premultiplying it by $M\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ to obtain a strictly positive-real transfer function $(MR_2)R_1^{-1}$; M will be called a positive real completion of R_2. If such M exists, then Th. 1 guarantees that there exists a Lyapunov function for the SLDS Σ' with behaviors $\ker\ R_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ and $\ker\ (MR_2)\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$; in this section we show that a Lyapunov function exists *also for the SLDS Σ with behaviors* $\ker\ R_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ *and* $\ker\ R_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$. Moreover, we also show the converse: *if a Lyapunov function for Σ exists, then there also exists a positive-real completion for R_2.*

Definition 6. *Let Σ be a standard SLDS. $M\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ is a* strictly positive-real completion *of $R_2R_1^{-1}$ if $MR_2R_1^{-1}$ is strictly positive-real.*

Remark 7. The existence of a positive-real completion for given $R_1,R_2\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ can be checked computationally solving an LMI associated with the dissipation inequality of the M parameter-dependent system represented in image form by $\mathrm{col}(MR_2,R_1)$. Such problem is straightforwardly solved in the scalar case, where an upper bound on the degree of the polynomial $M\in\mathbb{R}[\xi]$, namely $\deg(M)\leq\deg(R_1)-\deg(R_2)$, is known. In the multivariable case unfortunately an upper bound on the degree of M is not available, and the need arises to iteratively solve LMIs of increasing dimensions. Note that such iterative procedures are standard when dealing with higher-order dissipative systems, see e.g. p. 32 and Algorithm 4.1 p. 39 of [19]. □

The main result of this section is the following.

Theorem 2. *Let Σ be a standard SLDS. Assume $n_2 < n_1-\mathtt{w}$. The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *There exists a Lyapunov function Q_Ψ for Σ;*
2. *There exists a strictly positive-real completion $M\in\mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ for $R_2R_1^{-1}$.*

Proof: ((1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2)) Without loss of generality, we assume Q_Ψ in canonical form modulo R_1. To compute a positive-real completion, we need first to decompose Q_Ψ in a convenient way. Use Lemma 1 to define a state map $X_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ for $\mathfrak{B}_1$ as in (5), and Lemma 3 to conclude that there exists $\widetilde{\Psi} = \widetilde{\Psi}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}$ such that $\Psi(\zeta,\eta) = X_1(\zeta)^\top \widetilde{\Psi} X_1(\eta)$. Partition $\widetilde{\Psi}$ as $\widetilde{\Psi} =: \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{11} & \Psi_{12} \\ \Psi_{12}^\top & \Psi_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, where $\Psi_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $\Psi_{12} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times (n_1 - n_2)}$ and $\Psi_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times(n_1-n_2)}$. Consider the gluing conditions of the SLDS; following the same argument used in showing condition **C3** in the proof of Theorem 1, we conclude that Q_Ψ does not increase at the switching instants if and only if $\Psi_{12}^\top + \Psi_{22}\Pi = 0$. Consequently, we can rewrite $\widetilde{\Psi}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\Psi} &= \begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{11} & -\Pi\Psi_{22} \\ -\Psi_{22}\Pi & \Psi_{22} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{\Psi}' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \Pi^\top \\ -I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} \Psi_{22} \begin{bmatrix} \Pi & -I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where we define $\widetilde{\Psi}' := \Psi_{11} - \Pi^\top \Psi_{22} \Pi$. Pre- and post-multiply (9) by $X_1(\zeta)^\top$ on the left and $X_1(\eta)$ on the right to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\Psi(\zeta,\eta) = \\ &X_2(\zeta)^\top \tilde{\Psi}' X_2(\eta) \\ &+ X_1(\zeta)^\top \begin{bmatrix} \Pi^\top \\ -I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} \Psi_{22} \begin{bmatrix} \Pi & -I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} X_1(\eta) \ .\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

Π satisfies $X_1'(\xi) \bmod R_2 = \Pi X_2(\xi)$ (see Lemma 1); consequently

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Pi & -I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) \\ X_1'\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right) \end{bmatrix} w = 0$$

for all $w \in \mathfrak{B}_2$. We conclude that $Q_\Psi \overset{\mathfrak{B}_2}{=} Q_{\Psi'}$, and following an argument analogous to that used to prove **C2** in Theorem 1, that the functional $Q_{\Psi'}$ induced by the first addendum $\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) := X_2(\zeta)^\top \tilde{\Psi}' X_2(\eta)$ of (10) is a Lyapunov function for $\mathfrak{B}_2$.

Having decomposed $\Psi(\zeta,\eta)$, we aim at rewriting the expression in order to make evident what the positive-real completion matrix M is. To this purpose, consider the following result.

Lemma 6. *Define*

$$\begin{aligned}P(\xi) &:= (X_1'(\xi) - (X_1'(\xi) \mod R_2))R_2(\xi)^{-1} \\ &\in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times \mathtt{w}}[\xi] \ .\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\Psi(\zeta,\eta) = \Psi'(\zeta,\eta) + R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top \Psi_{22} P(\eta) R_2(\eta) \ . \tag{11}$$

Proof: See the Appendix. ■

We use (11) to obtain a convenient expression for the two-variable polynomial matrix corresponding to the derivative of Q_Ψ along $\mathfrak{B}_1$.

Lemma 7. *Let P be as in Lemma 6. There exists $B \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times\mathtt{w}}$ such that $-\Delta(\zeta,\eta) := (\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta,\eta) \bmod R_1$ satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned}-\Delta(\zeta,\eta) =& (\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta,\eta) - R_1(\zeta)^\top B^\top \Psi_{22} P(\eta) R_2(\eta) \\ &- R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\eta)^\top \Psi_{22} B R_1(\eta) \ .\end{aligned}$$

Proof: See the Appendix. ■

From the proof of Lemma 7 it follows that $B := \lim_{\xi\to\infty} \xi P(\xi) R_2(\xi) R_1(\xi)^{-1}$. We claim that the matrix M defined by

$$M(\xi) := B^\top \Psi_{22} P(\xi) \ , \tag{12}$$

is the desired positive-real completion of $R_2 R_1^{-1}$. Indeed, the equality established in Lemma 7, together with $-\Delta(\zeta,\eta) \overset{\mathfrak{B}_1}{<} 0$ and R_1 being Hurwitz, prove strict positive-realness of $MR_2R_1^{-1}$. Moreover, $MR_2R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper, since

$$\begin{aligned}&B^\top \Psi_{22} P(\xi) R_2(\xi) R_1(\xi)^{-1} \\ &= B^\top \Psi_{22} \left(X_1'(\xi) - \left(X_1'(\xi) \bmod R_2\right) R_2(\xi)^{-1} R_2(\xi)\right) R_1(\xi)^{-1} \\ &= B^\top \Psi_{22} \left(X_1'(\xi) - (X_1'(\xi) \bmod R_2) R_1(\xi)^{-1}\right) \ ,\end{aligned}$$

and since $X_1'(\xi) - (X_1'(\xi) \bmod R_2) R_1(\xi)^{-1}$ is strictly proper. This concludes the proof of *((1) $\Longrightarrow$ (2))*.

((2) $\Longrightarrow$ (1)). To prove the claim we show that there exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ such that among the storage functions for $(\varepsilon M R_2) R_1^{-1}$ there is one satisfying the conditions **C1**, **C2** and **C3** stated in the proof of Theorem 1. Such storage function also induces a Lyapunov function for Σ.

Lemma 8. *Let $(MR_2)R_1^{-1}$ be strictly proper and strictly positive-real. There exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and a storage function Q_Ψ for the system described in image form col$(R_1, \varepsilon M R_2)$ with a transfer function $(\varepsilon M R_2)R_1^{-1}$, and such that Q_Ψ satisfies condition* **C3** *of Theorem 1 for the standard SLDS with behaviors $\mathfrak{B}_1 := \ker\ R_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ and $\mathfrak{B}_2 := \ker\ R_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$.*

Proof: We begin by computing the state-space realization of $(MR_2)R_1^{-1}$ corresponding to the standard state map (see Lemmas 1, 4 and 5) $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ for $\mathfrak{B}_1$ of the form $X_1(\xi) := \begin{bmatrix} X_2(\xi) \\ X_1'(\xi) \end{bmatrix}$, where $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-\mathtt{w})\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ is a state map for $\mathfrak{B}_2$, and $X_1' \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$. Use the state equation for $\mathfrak{B}_1$, i.e. compute $\xi X_1(\xi) \bmod R_1$, to conclude the existence of

$A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1\times n_1}$ and $F_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1\times \mathtt{w}}$ such that $A_1X_1(\xi) = \xi X_1(\xi) - F_1R_1(\xi)$. Finally, note that since $(MR_2)R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper, we can write $M(\xi)R_2(\xi) = C_1X_1(\xi)$ for some $C_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times n_1}$. In the following we call C_1 the coefficient matrix of MR_2 with respect to X_1. It is readily verified that $(A_1, F_1, C_1, 0)$ is the desired realization of $(MR_2)R_1^{-1}$.

Let $\varepsilon > 0$; since $(MR_2)R_1^{-1}$ is strictly positive-real, also $\varepsilon(MR_2)R_1^{-1}$ is strictly positive-real. Thus, there exists a $P = P^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1\times n_1}$ such that

$$\begin{bmatrix} A_1^\top P + PA_1 & PF_1 - \varepsilon C_1^\top \\ -\varepsilon C_1 + F_1^\top P & 0 \end{bmatrix} \geq 0\ . \tag{13}$$

Observe that since the dissipation function for $\mathrm{col}(R_1, \varepsilon MR_2)$ is a quadratic function of the state X_1 (see Lemma 3), it holds that $PF_1 - \varepsilon C_1^\top = 0$. Now consider the largest solution P^+ to this LMI, associated with $(MR_2)R_1^{-1}$, corresponding to the anti-Hurwitz factorization of the polynomial matrix $\Phi(-\xi, \xi) = R_1(-\xi)^\top M(\xi)R_2(\xi) + R_2(-\xi)^\top M(-\xi)^\top R_1(\xi)$ where $\Phi(-\xi, \xi) = \Delta(-\xi, \xi)$. Denote the coefficient matrix of the anti-Hurwitz spectral factor with $\widetilde{A}$, i.e. $\Delta(\zeta, \eta) = A(\zeta)^\top A(\eta)$ with $A(\xi) := \widetilde{A}X_1(\xi)$. It follows that $A_1^\top P^+ + P^+A_1 = -\tilde{A}^\top\tilde{A}$; and from the fact that A_1 is Hurwitz and $\widetilde{A}$ corresponds to the anti-Hurwitz spectral factor, that the pair $(A_1, \widetilde{A})$ is observable. Now apply Theorem 7.4.7 of [11] to conclude that $P^+ > 0$.

We now show that there exists ε such that among the solutions P of (13), there exists one with the structure

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} P_{11} & -\Pi^\top P_{22} \\ -P_{22}\Pi & P_{22} \end{bmatrix}\ , \tag{14}$$

where $P_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2\times n_2}$, $P_{22} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times(n_1-n_2)}$, and $\Pi \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times n_2}$ represents the gluing conditions involved in the switch from $\ker\ R_1\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$ to $\ker\ R_2\left(\frac{d}{dt}\right)$, as in Def. 4.

Solving (13) is a convex problem (see the discussion in section 6.3.3 of [1], the last bullet on p. 93, and *ibidem*, section 2.2.2, line 7 p. 10). Now define the *universum set* U by

$$U := \{P = P^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1\times n_1} \mid P \geq 0 \text{ and } P \leq P^+\}\ . \tag{15}$$

Lemma 9. *U defined by (15) is closed and bounded.*

Proof: See the Appendix. ■

Define the *feasible set* L by

$$L := \Big\{P \in U \mid \exists\ \varepsilon > 0 \text{ s.t. } PF_1 - \varepsilon C_1^\top = 0, \\ \text{(14) holds}, P_{22} > 0 \text{ and } P_{11} - \Pi^\top P_{22}\Pi > 0\Big\}\ . \tag{16}$$

Lemma 10. *The feasible set L defined by (16) is nonempty.*

Proof: See Appendix. ■

The results of Lemmas 9 and 10 show that the conditions of Assumption 1 p. 43 of [7] are satisfied. Applying Theorem 16 of [7] we conclude that the convex optimization problem corresponding to the LMI (13) under the constraints defining L has a solution. Now define $\Psi(\zeta, \eta) := X_1(\zeta)^\top PX_1(\eta)$; because of the structure (14) of P, Q_Ψ satisfies condition **C3** of Theorem 1. ■

Since Q_Ψ is a storage function, there exists $D \in \mathbb{R}^{\bullet\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$ such that $\varepsilon R_1(\zeta)^\top M(\eta)R_2(\eta) + \varepsilon R_2(\zeta)^\top M(\zeta)^\top R_1(\eta) = (\zeta + \eta)\Psi(\zeta, \eta) + D(\zeta)^\top D(\eta)$. It is readily verified that Q_Ψ satisfies the conditions **C1** and **C2** in Theorem 1. Moreover, in a switch from $\mathfrak{B}_2$ to $\mathfrak{B}_1$ the value of Q_Ψ remains the same before and after the switch, while from Lemma 8 we conclude that in a switch from $\mathfrak{B}_1$ to $\mathfrak{B}_2$ it decreases. Q_Ψ is the desired Lyapunov function. ■

Remark 8. Numerical examples demonstrate that given a positive-real completion, the Lyapunov function of Theorem 2 does not correspond to a square spectral factorization, as was the case for the Lyapunov function in Theorem 1. Indeed, the largest storage function for $MR_2R_1^{-1}$ does not in general have the structure (14) guaranteeing that its value does not increase at switching times. Thus in general a purely algebraic computation of the Lyapunov function is unfeasible. However, the proof of $((2) \implies (1))$ of Theorem 2 shows how the problem of computing a Lyapunov function from a given positive-real completion can be reduced to solving a structured LMI using standard LMI solvers. □

Remark 9. There exist pairs of Hurwitz matrices which have no positive-real completion, for example the 1×1 matrices: $r_1(\xi) := 2523677 + 435616\xi + 81559\xi^2 + 7000\xi^3 + 603\xi^4 + 24\xi^5 + \xi^6$ and $r_2(\xi) := 65 + 46\xi + 26\xi^2 + 6\xi^3 + \xi^4$. □

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a framework for the analysis of linear switched systems in which the different dynamical regimes are not described in state-space form, and do not share a common state space; pivotal in our approach is the concept of gluing conditions, that impose concatenation constraints on the trajectories of the system at the switching instants. We have considered the problem of stability in this framework, and we have given Lyapunov conditions based on the concept of positive-realness, and constructive methods based on LMIs to compute Lyapunov functions.

The results presented here can only be considered preliminary to an application of our approach to other problems relevant for switched systems. Some issues under study are the establishment of sufficient conditions for the stability of switched linear differential systems with more than two dynamical regimes; a theory of dissipativity; stabilization, and other control problems.

APPENDIX
PROOF OF TECHNICAL RESULTS

Proof of Lemma 2: Let $f \in \mathfrak{X}_2$. Observe that $fR_2^{-1} \cdot R_2R_1^{-1} = fR_1^{-1}$. Since both fR_2^{-1} and $R_2R_1^{-1}$ are strictly proper, so is their product. Consequently, $f \in \mathfrak{X}_1$. ■

Proof of Lemma 3: To prove the claim on the dissipation function Q_Δ, write $\Delta(-\xi,\xi) = Q(-\xi)^\top Q(\xi) = D(-\xi)^\top N(\xi) + N(-\xi)^\top D(\xi)$, and define $G(\xi) := N(\xi)D(\xi)^{-1}$ and $H(\xi) := Q(\xi)D(\xi)^{-1}$. Then $H(-\xi)^\top H(\xi) = G(\xi) + G(-\xi)^\top$. Now write $H(\xi) =: \begin{bmatrix} h_1(\xi)^\top & \cdots & h_{\mathtt{w}}(\xi)^\top \end{bmatrix}$ with $h_k \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times 1}[\xi]$, $k = 1,\ldots,\mathtt{w}$, and observe that because of the strict properness of ND^{-1} it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\omega\to\infty} H(-j\omega)^\top H(j\omega)\\
&= \lim_{\omega\to\infty} \begin{bmatrix} h_1(-j\omega)^\top \\ \vdots \\ h_r(-j\omega)^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} h_1(j\omega) & \cdots & h_r(j\omega) \end{bmatrix}\\
&= \lim_{\omega\to\infty} G(-j\omega)^\top + G(j\omega) = 0 \ .
\end{aligned}$$

The diagonal entries of $H(-j\omega)^\top H(j\omega)$ are $\|h_1(j\omega)\|^2,\ldots,\|h_{\mathtt{w}}(j\omega)\|^2$, and thus $\lim_{\omega\to\infty}\|h_k(j\omega)\|^2 = 0$ for $k = 1,\ldots,\mathtt{w}$. It follows that the columns $h_k(\xi)$ of $H(\xi) = Q(\xi)D(\xi)^{-1}$ are strictly proper, as was to be proved.

To prove the statement about the storage function Q_Ψ with associated dissipation rate Q_Δ, write $Q(\zeta)^\top Q(\eta) + (\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta,\eta) = D(\zeta)^\top N(\eta) + N(\zeta)^\top D(\eta)$. Premultiply both sides by $D(\zeta)^{-\top}$ to obtain $D(\zeta)^{-\top}Q(\zeta)^\top Q(\eta) + (\zeta+\eta)D(\zeta)^{-\top}\Psi(\zeta,\eta) = N(\eta) + D(\zeta)^{-\top}N(\zeta)^\top D(\eta)$. Now compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\zeta\to\infty} D(\zeta)^{-\top}Q(\zeta)^\top Q(\eta) + (\zeta+\eta)D(\zeta)^{-\top}\Psi(\zeta,\eta)\\
&= \lim_{\zeta\to\infty} N(\eta) + D(\zeta)^{-\top}N(\zeta)^\top D(\eta) \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Since ND^{-1} and QD^{-1} are strictly proper we obtain $\lim_{\zeta\to\infty}(\zeta+\eta)D(\zeta)^{-\top}\Psi(\zeta,\eta) = \lim_{\zeta\to\infty} N(\eta)$. Using the given canonical factorization of $\Psi(\zeta,\eta)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\zeta\to\infty} D(\zeta)^{-\top}M(\zeta)^\top(\zeta\Sigma_\Psi + \eta\Sigma_\Psi)G(\eta)\\
&= \lim_{\zeta\to\infty} N(\eta) = N(\eta) \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Assume by contradiction that $H(\zeta) := M(\zeta)D(\zeta)^{-1}$ is not strictly proper, and write $H(\zeta) = H_L\zeta^L + \ldots + H_0 + S(\zeta)$, where $L \geq 0$ and $S(\zeta)$ is strictly proper. Then $\lim_{\zeta\to\infty} D(\zeta)^{-\top}G(\zeta)^\top(\zeta\Sigma_\Psi + \eta\Sigma_\Psi)G(\eta)$ is infinite, a contradiction. Consequently, $H(\xi) := M(\xi)D(\xi)^{-1}$ is strictly proper. ■

Proof of Lemma 4: The claim on the limit being finite follows from the fact that $X_1'R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper. Recall from section II-C1 that there exist $A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1\times n_1}$, $F_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1\times\mathtt{w}}$ such that

$$\xi X_1(\xi) = A_1X_1(\xi) + F_1(\xi)R_1(\xi) \ . \tag{17}$$

Now observe that since $R_2R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper and R_1 is column-reduced, each of the column degrees of R_2 is at least one less than the degree of the corresponding column of R_1. It follows that $\lim_{\xi\to\infty}\xi X_2(\xi)R_1(\xi)^{-1} = 0_{n_2\times\mathtt{w}}$, and consequently the first n_2 rows of F_1 are equal to zero, i.e.

$$F_1 = \lim_{\xi\to\infty}\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \xi X_1'(\xi)R_1(\xi)^{-1}\end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ k \end{bmatrix} \ , \tag{18}$$

with $k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times\mathtt{w}}$.

Since $R_2R_1^{-1}$ is strictly positive real and using the equalities $\Psi(\zeta,\eta) = X_1(\zeta)^\top\widetilde{\Psi}X_1(\eta)$ and $\Delta(\zeta,\eta) = X_1(\zeta)^\top\widetilde{\Delta}X_1(\eta)$ established previously, write

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\zeta+\eta)X_1(\zeta)^\top\widetilde{\Psi}X_1(\eta) + X_1(\zeta)^\top\widetilde{\Delta}X_1(\eta)\\
&= (A_1X_1(\zeta) + F_1R_1(\zeta))^\top\,\widetilde{\Psi}X_1(\eta)\\
&\quad + X_1(\zeta)^\top\widetilde{\Psi}\,(A_1X_1(\eta) + F_1R_1(\eta)) + X_1(\zeta)^\top\widetilde{\Delta}X_1(\eta)\\
&= X_1(\zeta)^\top\left(A_1^\top\widetilde{\Psi} + \widetilde{\Psi}A_1\right)X_1(\eta) + R_1(\zeta)^\top F_1^\top\widetilde{\Psi}X_1(\eta)\\
&\quad + X_1(\zeta)^\top\widetilde{\Psi}F_1R_1(\eta) + X_1(\zeta)^\top\widetilde{\Delta}X_1(\eta)\\
&= R_1(\zeta)^\top R_2(\eta) + R_2(\zeta)^\top R_1(\eta) \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Now multiply on the left by $R_1(\zeta)^{-\top}$ both sides of the equality, and take the limit for $\zeta\to\infty$; since $X_1R_1^{-1}$ and $R_2R_1^{-1}$ are strictly proper, we obtain $R_2(\xi) = F_1^\top\widetilde{\Psi}X_1(\xi) = k^\top\left(\Psi_{12}^\top X_2(\xi) + \Psi_{22}X_1'(\xi)\right)$. ■

Proof of Lemma 5: Following the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4, we write $A_1X_1(\xi) = \xi X_1(\xi) - \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ k \end{bmatrix} R_1(\xi)$. From Lemma 4 and the fact that R_2 is square and nonsingular, it follows that $k^\top$ is of full row rank, and consequently $n_1 - n_2 \geq \mathtt{w}$.

In order to prove that $n_1 - n_2 = \mathtt{w}$, assume by contradiction that $n_1 - n_2 > \mathtt{w}$. Then there exists one column of R_1 whose column degree is greater than or equal to the degree of the corresponding column of R_2 plus two; w.l.o.g. assume that this is the first column of R_1. Then, possibly rearranging the rows of X_1', write

$$X_1'(\xi) := \begin{bmatrix} e_1\xi^{\delta_1^2} \\ e_1\xi^{\delta_1^2+1} \\ e_2\xi^{\delta_1^2+2} \\ \vdots \\ e_1\xi^{\delta_1^1-1} \\ \vdots \end{bmatrix} .$$

Moreover, permute the rows of X_1' so that $e_i\xi^{\delta_i^1-1}$, $i = 1,\dots,\mathtt{w}$, are its last $\mathtt{w}$ rows. Note that these operations correspond to permutations of the rows of $k = \lim_{\xi\to\infty} \xi X_1'(\xi)R_1(\xi)^{-1}$.

Given this structure of X_1', note that the last $\mathtt{w}$ rows of k contain the inverse of the highest column coefficient matrix of R_1, while its first $n_1 - n_2 - \mathtt{w}$ rows are equal to zero, i.e. $k^\top = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{(n_1-n_2-\mathtt{w})\times\mathtt{w}} & k'^\top \end{bmatrix}$, with $k' \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}$ nonsingular. Denote the last $\mathtt{w}$ rows of Ψ_{22} by $\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{22}' & \Psi_{22}'' \end{bmatrix}$ with $\Psi_{22}' \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times(n_1-n_2-\mathtt{w})}$ and $\Psi_{22}'' \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times\mathtt{w}}$. From Lemma 4, $R_2(\xi) = k^\top\left(\Psi_{12}^\top X_2(\xi) + \Psi_{22}X_1'(\xi)\right)$, and consequently $R_2(\xi) = k'^\top\Psi_{12}'^\top X_2(\xi) + k'^\top\begin{bmatrix} \Psi_{22}' & \Psi_{22}'' \end{bmatrix} X_1'(\xi)$, where $\Psi_{12}'^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w}\times n_2}$ denotes the last $\mathtt{w}$ rows of $\Psi_{12}^\top$. Note that due to the positive definiteness of Ψ_{22}, also $\Psi_{22}'' > 0$; then the highest column coefficient matrix of $R_2(\xi)$ is $k'\Psi_{22}''$, and its first column is associated with the column degree $\delta_1^1 - 1 = \delta_1^2 + 1$. This contradicts the fact that the first column of $R_2(\xi)$ has degree δ_1^2. Consequently we conclude that $n_1 - n_2 = \mathtt{w}$ and that k is nonsingular. The claim is proved. ■

Proof of Lemma 6: From the definition of Π it follows that $\begin{bmatrix} \Pi & -I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} X_2(\xi) \\ X_1'(\xi) \end{bmatrix} = X_1'(\xi) \bmod R_2 - X_1'(\xi)$. Write $X_1'(\xi)R_2(\xi)^{-1} = P(\xi) + S(\xi)$, with $S(\xi)$ a strictly proper polynomial matrix and $P \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times\mathtt{w}}[\xi]$; then

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} \Pi & -I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix}\begin{bmatrix} X_2(\xi) \\ X_1'(\xi) \end{bmatrix} &= X_1'(\xi) - P(\xi)R_2(\xi) - X_1'(\xi) \\ &= -P(\xi)R_2(\xi) . \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Substituting (19) in (10), we obtain (11). ■

Proof of Lemma 7: From (11) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} (\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta,\eta) =& (\zeta+\eta)\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) \\ &+ (\zeta+\eta)R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top\Psi_{22}P(\eta)R_2(\eta) \\ =& (\zeta+\eta)\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) \\ &+ \zeta R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top\Psi_{22}P(\eta)R_2(\eta) \\ &+ R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top\Psi_{22}P(\eta)R_2(\eta)\eta . \end{aligned}$$

We now compute $(\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta,\eta) \bmod R_1 =: -\Delta(\zeta,\eta)$. Since Ψ_{22} is by assumption positive definite and symmetric, there exists a nonsingular matrix G such that $\Psi_{22} = G^\top G$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} (\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta,\eta) =& (\zeta+\eta)\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) \\ &+ \zeta R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top G^\top GP(\eta)R_2(\eta) \\ &+ R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top G^\top GP(\eta)R_2(\eta)\eta . \end{aligned}$$

$\Psi'(\zeta,\eta)$ is a function of the state of $\mathfrak{B}_2$, i.e. $\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) = X_2(\zeta)^\top\widetilde{\Psi'}X_2(\eta)$ for some $\widetilde{\Psi}' \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2\times n_2}$, and $R_2R_1^{-1}$ is strictly proper. Consequently, in order to compute $(\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta,\eta) \bmod R_1$ it is enough to compute $GP(\xi)R_2(\xi)\xi \bmod R_1$. From (19) it follows that $GP(\xi)R_2(\xi)\xi = G\begin{bmatrix} -\Pi & I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} X_1(\xi)\xi$; moreover by (17), $\xi X_1(\xi) = A_1X_1(\xi) + F_1R_1(\xi)$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} GP(\xi)R_2(\xi)\xi =& G\begin{bmatrix} -\Pi & I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix}(A_1X_1(\xi) + F_1R_1(\xi)) \\ =& G\begin{bmatrix} -\Pi & I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} A_1X_1(\xi) \\ &+ G\underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} -\Pi & I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} F_1}_{=:B} R_1(\xi) \\ =& G\begin{bmatrix} -\Pi & I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} A_1X_1(\xi) + GBR_1(\xi) . \end{aligned}$$

where $B \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1-n_2)\times\mathtt{w}}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} GP(\xi)R_2(\xi)\xi \bmod R_1 &= G\begin{bmatrix} -\Pi & I_{(n_1-n_2)} \end{bmatrix} A_1X_1(\xi) \\ &= GP(\xi)R_2(\xi)\xi - GBR_1(\xi) . \end{aligned}$$

Note that B satisfies $B = \lim_{\xi\to\infty} P(\xi)R_2(\xi)\xi R_1(\xi)^{-1}$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &-\Delta(\zeta,\eta) \\ &= (\zeta+\eta)\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) \\ &\quad + \left(\zeta R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top - R_1(\zeta)^\top B^\top\right) G^\top GP(\eta)R_2(\eta) \\ &\quad + R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top G^\top G\left(P(\eta)R_2(\eta)\eta - BR_1(\eta)\right) \\ &= (\zeta+\eta)\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) + \zeta R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top G^\top GP(\eta)R_2(\eta) \\ &\quad - R_1(\zeta)^\top B^\top G^\top GP(\eta)R_2(\eta) \\ &\quad + R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top G^\top GP(\eta)R_2(\eta)\eta \\ &\quad - R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top G^\top GBR_1(\eta) \\ &= (\zeta+\eta)\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) + (\zeta+\eta)R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top G^\top GP(\eta)R_2(\eta) \\ &\quad - R_1(\zeta)^\top B^\top G^\top GP(\eta)R_2(\eta) \\ &\quad - R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top G^\top GBR_1(\eta) . \end{aligned}$$

From (11) we conclude that $(\zeta+\eta)\Psi'(\zeta,\eta) + (\zeta+\eta)R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top G^\top GP(\eta)R_2(\eta) = (\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta,\eta)$, and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} -\Delta(\zeta,\eta) =& (\zeta+\eta)\Psi(\zeta+\eta) \\ &- R_1(\zeta)^\top B^\top\Psi_{22}P(\eta)R_2(\eta) \\ &- R_2(\zeta)^\top P(\zeta)^\top\Psi_{22}BR_1(\eta) , \end{aligned}$$

as was to be proved. ■

Proof of Lemma 9: To prove closedness, fix a basis $\left\{P_i \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1 \times n_1}, P_i = P_i^\top\right\}_{i=1,\dots,\frac{n_1(n_1+1)}{2}}$ for the space of symmetric n_1-dimensional matrices, i.e. every $P = P^\top$ can be written as $P = \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{n_1(n_1+1)}{2}} \alpha_i P_i$ for some coefficients $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$. $P \in U$ if and only if

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0_{n_1 \times n_1} & 0_{n_1 \times n_1} \\ 0_{n_1 \times n_1} & P^+ \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{n_1(n_1+1)}{2}} \alpha_i \begin{bmatrix} P_i & 0_{n_1 \times n_1} \\ 0_{n_1 \times n_1} & -P_i \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \ . \tag{20}$$

The left hand side of (20) is a matrix whose entries are real linear polynomials in the $\frac{n_1(n_1+1)}{2}$ indeterminates α_i. The set consisting of all the $\frac{n_1(n_1+1)}{2}$-ples $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\frac{n_1(n_1+1)}{2}}$ such that (20) holds is a *spectrahedron*, and it is a closed set, see p. 1944 of [8]. Consequently U is closed.

To prove boundedness, choose the metric of the induced Euclidean norm on the space of matrices; then U is contained in the closed ball with radius equal to the largest eigenvalue of $P^+ > 0$. ■

Proof of Lemma 10: Partition $C_1 =: \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{N}_1 & \widetilde{N}_2 \end{bmatrix}$, with $\widetilde{N}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times n_2}$ and $\widetilde{N}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathtt{w} \times (n_1 - n_2)}$, i.e.

$$C_1 X_1(\xi) = M(\xi) R_2(\xi) = \begin{bmatrix} \widetilde{N}_1 & \widetilde{N}_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} X_2(\xi) \\ X_1'(\xi) \end{bmatrix} \ . \tag{21}$$

Define $k \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1 - n_2) \times \mathtt{w}}$ by $F_1^\top =: \begin{bmatrix} 0_{\mathtt{w} \times n_2} & k^\top \end{bmatrix}$; then P of the form (14) satisfies $PF_1 - C_1^\top = 0$ if and only if $-\Pi^\top P_{22} k - \widetilde{N}_1^\top = 0$ and $P_{22} k - \widetilde{N}_2^\top = 0$. We now show that if the second equality holds, then the first equality is automatically satisfied. Rewrite equation (21) as $\widetilde{N}_2 X_1'(\xi) = M(\xi) R_2(\xi) - \widetilde{N}_1 X_2(\xi)$ and compute $\widetilde{N}_2 X_1'(\xi) \bmod R_2 = -\widetilde{N}_1 X_2(\xi)$. Recall that $X_1'(\xi) \bmod R_2 = \Pi X_2(\xi)$, and conclude that

$$-\Pi^\top \widetilde{N}_2^\top = \widetilde{N}_1^\top \ . \tag{22}$$

Consequently if $P_{22} k = \widetilde{N}_2^\top$, then (22) is automatically satisfied.

Thus to prove that L is non-empty it suffices to show that there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that among the matrices P with structure (14), and such that $k^\top P_{22} = \varepsilon \widetilde{N}_2$, there is at least one such that also $P_{22} > 0$, $P_{11} - \Pi^\top P_{22} \Pi > 0$, and that is smaller than or equal to the maximal storage function P^+.

In order to do this, transform congruently P in (14) to the form $\begin{bmatrix} P_{11} - \Pi^\top P_{22} \Pi & 0 \\ 0 & P_{22} \end{bmatrix}$, and apply the same transformation to P^+. To keep the notation light, in the following we use the same symbols to denote the matrices P and P^+ before and after the change of variables. Partition the (congruence-transformed) P^+ as $P^+ =: \begin{bmatrix} P_{11}^+ & P_{12}^+ \\ P_{12}^{+\top} & P_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix}$, where $P_{11}^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$, $P_{22}^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{(n_1 - n_2) \times (n_1 - n_2)}$, $P_{12}^+ \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times (n_1 - n_2)}$.

Let ε be a positive real parameter and define

$$\begin{aligned} P_{22,\varepsilon} &:= \varepsilon P_{22}^+ \\ P_{11,\varepsilon} &:= (1+\varepsilon) \Pi^\top P_{22,\epsilon} \Pi = (1+\varepsilon) \varepsilon \Pi^\top P_{22}^+ \Pi \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Note that since $P_{22}^+ > 0$, also $P_{11,\varepsilon} > 0$ and $P_{22,\varepsilon} > 0$. We now prove that there exists $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$, $\varepsilon > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} P_{11}^+ & P_{12}^+ \\ P_{12}^{+\top} & P_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} P_{11,\varepsilon} - \Pi^\top P_{22,\varepsilon} \Pi & 0 \\ 0 & P_{22,\varepsilon} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} P_{11}^+ - \varepsilon^2 \Pi^\top P_{22}^+ \Pi & P_{12}^+ \\ P_{12}^{+\top} & (1-\varepsilon) P_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \ . \end{aligned}$$

To do so, compute factorizations $P_{22}^+ = V^\top V$, $\Pi^\top P_{22}^+ \Pi = W^\top W$ for some nonsingular W, V of dimension $n_1 - n_2$ and n_2, respectively. Rewrite the last inequality as

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} P_{11}^+ & P_{12}^+ \\ P_{12}^{+\top} & P_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} \\ &- \begin{bmatrix} W^\top & 0 \\ 0 & V^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon^2 I_{n_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon I_{n_1 - n_2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W & 0 \\ 0 & V \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \ , \end{aligned}$$

then bring it to the equivalent form

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} W^{-\top} & 0 \\ 0 & V^{-\top} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} P_{11}^+ & P_{12}^+ \\ P_{12}^{+\top} & P_{22}^+ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} W^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & V^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &- \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon^2 I_{n_2} & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon I_{n_1 - n_2} \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \ . \end{aligned}$$

The first matrix on the LHS is known, and it is positive-definite; call it $P^{+\prime}$. To satisfy the inequality, choose $0 < \varepsilon < \lambda_{\text{min}}(P^{+\prime})$, the latter being the smallest eigenvalue of $P^{+\prime}$.

In order to complete the proof of the Lemma, we need to show that having chosen ε in this way and defined P from (23), we obtain a matrix satisfying the equality $PF_1 - \varepsilon C_1^\top = 0$. Observe that P^+ before the congruence transformation satisfied $P^+ F_1 - C_1^\top = 0$, and consequently before the congruence transformation $k^\top P_{22}^+ = \widetilde{N}_2^\top$; it follows from the definition of $P_{22,\varepsilon}$ in (23) that $k^\top P_{22,\varepsilon} = \varepsilon \widetilde{N}_2^\top$. Using (22) we conclude that $PF_1 - \varepsilon C_1^\top = 0$. ■

REFERENCES

[1] S. Boyd, L.E. Ghaoui, and V. Balakrishnan. *Linear Matrix Inequalities in System and Control Theory*. Society for Industrial Mathematics, 1994.

[2] W.A. Coppel. *Linear Systems*, Notes in Pure Mathematics, Australian National University. 6, 1972.

[3] J. P. Hespanha and A. S. Morse. Switching between stabilizing controllers. *Automatica*, 38(11):1905–1917, 2002.

[4] T. Kailath. *Linear Systems*. Prentice-Hall Information and System Sciences Series, 1980.

[5] D. Liberzon. *Switching in Systems and Control*. Birkhauser. Boston, Basel, Berlin, 2003.

[6] H. Lin and P.J. Antsaklis. Stability and stabilizability of switched linear systems: A survey of recent results. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(2):308–322, 2009.

[7] A. Nedić. *Lecture notes on Optimization I*. Network Mathematics Graduate Programme Hamilton Institute.

[8] T. Netzer, D. Plaumann, and M. Schweighofe. Exposed faces of semidefinitely representable sets. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 20(4):1944–1955, 2010.

[9] R. Newcomb. *Linear Multiport Synthesis*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

[10] R. Peeters and P. Rapisarda. A two-variable approach to solve the polynomial Lyapunov equation. *Syst. Contr. Lett.*, 42:117–126, 2001.

[11] J.W. Polderman and J.C. Willems. *Introduction to Mathematical System Theory: A Behavioral Approach*. Springer, Berlin, 1997.

[12] P. Rapisarda and P. Rocha. Positive realness and Lyapunov functions. *Proceedings of the 20th International Symposium on Mathematical Theory of Networks and Systems*, 2012. Melbourne, Australia.

[13] P. Rapisarda and J.C. Willems. State maps for linear systems. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 35(3):1053–1091, 1997.

[14] P. Rocha, J.C. Willems, P. Rapisarda, and D. Napp. On the stability of switched behavioral systems. *50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference (CDC-ECC)*, pages 1534–1538, 2011.

[15] R. Shorten, K.S. Narendra, and O. Mason. A result on common quadratic Lyapunov functions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(1):110–113, 2003.

[16] R.N. Shorten and K.S. Narendra. On common quadratic Lyapunov functions for pairs of stable lti systems whose system matrices are in companion form. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 48(4):618–621, 2003.

[17] Z. Sun and S.S. Ge. *Switched Linear Systems: Control and Design*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.

[18] S. Trenn. *Switched differential algebraic equations. Dynamics and Control of Switched Electronic Systems*. Chapter 6 of: Francesco Vasca and Luigi Iannelli (eds.), Springer Verlag, 2012.

[19] H. L. Trentelman and P. Rapisarda. New algorithms for polynomial j-spectral factorization. *Math. Contr. Sign. Syst.*, 12:24–614, 1999.

[20] J.C. Willems and H.L. Trentelman. On quadratic differential forms. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 36:1703–1749, 1998.

[21] H. Ye, A.N. Michel, and L. Hou. Stability theory for hybrid dynamical systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 43(4):461–474, 1998.